

REMARKS

Applicants note that an advisory action was received in response to the previously filed Supplemental Amendment, which was not entered by the Examiner. Prior to receiving the final office action, Applicants had filed the Supplemental Amendment to correct informalities in the application and therefore resubmit those application amendments in the present amendment. From the record, it appears the Examiner believed the Supplemental Amendment was the response after final rejection. In fact, this amendment is the intended response after final.

Two paragraphs of the specification and claim 20 are herein amended to correct additional typographical errors found (replacing "ground plan" with "ground plane"). Further, claims 20 and 21 are amended herein. Thus, claims 1-26 remain pending in the application.

Further, Applicants have discovered an error in Fig. 2 of the formal drawings. The informal drawing of Fig. 2 shows the correct connections of elements 220, 212 and 210, while the previously submitted formal drawing of Fig. 2 showed incorrect connections of element 220, 212 and 210. Accordingly, Applicants herewith submit a new set of replacement formal drawings, where Fig. 2 now shows the correct connections as originally shown in the informal drawings.

In the final office action, the Examiner indicated allowability of claims 1-19 and 22-26. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indicated allowability of these claims.

Claims 20 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Pankinaho (US 6,498,586). The Examiner pointed out that Pankinaho discloses all the limitations of claims 20 and 21. Applicants respectfully disagree. However, to better distinguish claims 20 and 21 from Pankinaho, Applicants have amended claims 20 and 21.

The amended claims 20 and 21 now include the limitation that the connections to the radiating element are made to a continuous straight edge of the radiating element. All figures of the present application show that the connecting edge of the radiating element is a continuous straight edge, and the edge does not have any gaps. Therefore, no new matter has been introduced.

Pankinaho discloses a different type of radiating element which does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 20 and 21. In all figures showing two connections to the radiating element (Figs. 8a – 15), there is only one connection shown to a single edge of the radiating element. For example, Fig. 9 of Pankinaho does not show a single continuous and straight edge with two connections thereto. Rather, connecting element 108 connects to a first edge and connecting element 107 connects to a different edge of radiating element 102. These different edges are separated by gap 110, which preclude interpretation as a continuous and straight edge. A further indicator that the radiating element is connected at two different edges can be seen in the fact that the actual connecting points are not within "a single" line. Connector 107 is either connected with an offset with respect to connector 108 or at an angle of 90 degrees depending on what point defines the actual connection. It is not believed that

Pankinaho suggests a single continuous and straight edge of a radiating element for connecting two different connector elements.


Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 20 and 21 are also allowable over the cited art.

SUMMARY

In light of the above remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested. It is further submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and early notice of the same is earnestly solicited.

Date: September 11, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Rosa S. Kim

Reg. No. 39,728

Telephone: 650.694.5330

Facsimile: 650.968.4517

SIEMENS CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Department
Telephone: 732-321-3026